

94

EXPRESSED PROBLEMS OF A SELECTED GROUP OF
YOUNG HOMEMAKERS WITH IMPLICATIONS FOR
A HIGH SCHOOL HOME ECONOMICS PROGRAM

by

DORA CHARLOTTIE ROSS

B. A. Washburn University, 1949

A MASTER'S REPORT

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE

School of Education

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

1964

Approved by:

Bernadine H. Peterson
Major Professor

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The investigator wishes to express sincere appreciation to her major instructor Dr. Bernadine Peterson for her patience and guidance, and to Dr. Genevieve Schubert whose questionnaire was modified for use in this study.

L
544
A4
1964
R 823
C.2

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
INTRODUCTION	1
STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM	3
PROCEDURE	4
REVIEW OF LITERATURE	6
The American family, yesterday and today	6
Roles of family members	11
Employment of women	13
Marriage age	16
The home economics program	22
Summary	33
FINDINGS IN THIS STUDY--IMPLICATIONS FOR PROGRAM	
PLANNING IN THE HIGH SCHOOL	35
SUMMARY	50
BIBLIOGRAPHY	53
APPENDIX A	57
APPENDIX B	65

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
I. Homemaking Facilities and Conveniences	
Reported by Respondents	37
II. Enjoyment of Homemaking Activities	39
III. Problem Areas Most Frequently Identified	
as Causing Difficulties	42
IV. Sources of Ideas and Techniques for Homemaking .	44

INTRODUCTION

Cultural changes affect the family as a social and cultural unit. Effects of such changes are reflected in the changing roles of men and women, fathers and mothers, and in families. Each year more and more wives and mothers take employment outside the home.

The per cent of wives and mothers who are working outside the home has shown a steady rise. According to Ogburn and Nimkoff,¹ the number of married women at work exceeded the number of single women in 1949. The authors remarked: "Perhaps both the job and the small family are often expressions of the same influence, namely, the desire for a higher standard of living."²

Our young people are marrying at an earlier age. The United States has one of the highest marriage rates in the western world. Fulcomer³ stated that from 1940-1958 the marriage rate in the United States increased 231 per cent, while teen-age marriages increased 477 per cent, which was partly due to a larger number of teen-agers in our country today. The per cent of teen-age marriages is not larger,

¹W. F. Ogburn and M. F. Nimkoff, Technology and the Changing Family, p. 12.

²Ibid., p. 13.

³David M. Fulcomer, "What Are Today's Families Like?" Journal of Home Economics, 55:693, November, 1963.

but the number of marriages has increased. Many young people rushed into marriage with little preparation. Hurd's study indicated that the tremendous number of teen-age marriages produced more children, more annulments, more divorces, more school drop-outs, and more unhappiness than marriages among adults in the age group twenty-five to twenty-nine years old. The study also stated that 39 per cent of brides and 12 per cent of grooms were under twenty years old. According to Fulcomer,² half of our young women are married by the time they are twenty, and half of the young men by the time they are twenty-three. Fulcomer quoted Freedman: "Among those recently married, college educated women expect to have the largest families, and those with only a grade school education the smallest."³ He also quoted Dr. Leo W. Simmons who wrote: "The creation of more stable marriages and family life is part of the teacher's unfinished business."⁴

As these changes took place new problems and needs have developed for the young homemaker. Kinds of family needs were listed in a recent article by McGuire⁵ as

¹Helen Hurd, "The Changing Society and Its Challenges," Journal of Home Economics, 55:89, February, 1963.

²Fulcomer, op. cit., p. 693.

³Ibid., p. 694.

⁴Ibid., p. 698.

⁵Marie McGuire, "Our Cities Need You," Journal of Home Economics, 55:100, February, 1963.

operation, care, and upkeep of equipment; selection and care of furnishing; management of play space for children; provisions of food for the family; and money management.

All these situations indicated possible opportunity for home economics teachers to aid young homemakers in gaining success and satisfaction from their new roles. Forrest stressed, according to Peterson: "Teachers need to provide opportunities for (adolescents) to participate in experiences which will not only be satisfying but will advance them in the process of becoming adults."¹

The investigator made a study of a selected group of young married women: (1) to identify problems and needs of these young women; and (2) to identify opportunities and contributions for home economics education to assist in meeting needs and solving problems for these young brides.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

It was the purpose of this study (1) to discover the number of young marriages among a selected group of Delia High School graduates; (2) to identify the problem areas in relation to homemaking among the young married subjects; and (3) to suggest appropriate revisions of present offering in the high school home economics program at Delia High School.

¹Bernadine Peterson, "Experimental Use of the Problem Solving Method in Teaching a Home Economics Class," unpublished Doctor's dissertation, p. 56.

PROCEDURE

The setting chosen for this study was the rural community of Delia, Kansas. The participating group consisted of eight young homemakers who had graduated from Delia High School between the years of 1957-1963. The study was made through the use of a questionnaire.

Delia has a population of approximately two hundred residents. The chief source of income for the community is from the farm products and employment at Goodyear Tire Company in Topeka, Kansas. The community is located north west of the capital city of Topeka. The high school is a one-story brick structure built in 1955. In September, 1963, there was an enrollment of forty-one students. Eight or ten students are graduated from the school each year. These graduates find employment in Topeka or attend Washburn University or Kansas State University. Homemaking I and II is offered each year to freshman and junior girls respectively. In the years from 1957-1963 twenty-three girls were graduated from Delia High School: nine are married, an additional eleven are employed, and three are attending college. In the married group one girl is a graduate nurse, one a business college graduate, and two attended college. In the employed group two are Kansas State University graduates.

Schubert,¹ in a study made at the University of Wisconsin in 1959, made a survey of 104 homemakers who had graduated from Sturgeon Bay High School, Sturgeon Bay, Wisconsin, between 1951-1956. These young women were under twenty-six years of age, and had been married from one to five years. The study was made by questionnaire.

The population of eight young homemakers used in the present study was defined in the same manner as the population used by Schubert.² The investigator received permission from Schubert to use certain portions of her (Schubert's) questionnaire. The questionnaire, as adapted for this study, appears in Appendix A. Respondents in this study were located by means of school records, to which the investigator had access. A letter (Appendix B) was sent to the graduates from 1957-1963 who are married and engaged in homemaking, requesting their participation.

¹Schubert and Dalrymple, "Problems and Needs of Young Homemakers--Implications for High School Home Economics," Journal of Home Economics, 51:365-66, May, 1959.

²Ibid.

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

If home economics teachers are aware of the changes that are taking place in the American family, they can be more aware of the problems which will be faced by students, the young homemakers of tomorrow.

Elmer¹ identified the family as providing a place for development of a proper social and emotional basis for the child, since adequate nurture not only helps the child to become a properly adjusted individual but also prepares him for a role and function in the society to which he belongs. The significant aspects of the family are, according to Elmer,² reproduction, nurture of children, and mutual sympathetic understanding and helpfulness.

The American family, yesterday and today. Anthropologists tell us that far back in the dawn of history man lived in a family in his cave dwelling and other crude structures that served as his home. The development of agricultural skills and implements meant that families could settle down and not have to keep on the move searching for new food supplies.

The idea that the man is the head of the house has

¹M. C. Elmer, The Sociology of the Family, p. 3.

²Ibid.

grown from hundreds of years of history and tradition. Almost all early civilizations were headed by males. The Roman father, according to Force,¹ had literally absolute control over his entire family. He controlled the family property and also the conduct of his wife, his sons, and his unmarried daughters. Roman women simply didn't count in a legal or social sense. Although her husband's affection for her and her duties at home gave the Roman wife and mother some prestige, she was not much more than a possession. The idea that the man should be the head of the family carried over even to more modern times. The early New England family was a patriarchal one.

Gradually a change took place in Colonial America. Life was unusually hard, and women were required to carry men's burdens in addition to their usual ones of bearing and caring for the children. Many husbands began to realize that their wives were very important partners and that therefore their wives had some claim to equality. The wife's status gradually changed and she received more recognition of her worth.

The Industrial revolution, with its factories and its jobs for women, brought about one of the most important changes in the position of women. With the widespread

development of the factory, families began to cluster around the industrial cities. According to Duvall,¹ almost two-thirds of our families lived in rural areas in 1890.

Mead described the old ideal of the family:

The grandparents were in it. They were welcomed and loved. There were a lot of tools for Grandfather to mend and socks for Grandmother to darn. Everybody supposedly had the same education, and they all spoke the same language. They lived in the country in a big house. Children were assets, so that people were delighted to have any number of them. And the family always did things as a whole, even to walking home from church on Sunday night.²

Family life in the last several generations has changed more drastically and more rapidly than ever before in the history of man. Families have shifted from an economy of scarcity to an economy of abundance. According to Fishbein and Kennedy,³ one-half of today's families own their homes, three-fourths of the families own at least part of their furniture, and there are more radios in use than there are families. Today's families are on the go too. Duvall⁴ stated that in the years between 1940-1946 nearly seventy million families moved in the United States--nearly ten million a year. Today families are smaller and easier to

¹Ruth Duvall, Family Living, p. 340.

²Margaret Mead, "How Fares the American Family?" National Parent-Teacher, 49:22, February, 1955.

³Morris Fishbein and Ruby Jo Reeves Kennedy, Modern Marriage and Family Living, p. 289.

⁴Duvall, op. cit., p. 338.

move. Families no longer stay together the way they used to. Children marry and move across the continent. A husband and father may take a job miles away from his home and see his family only occasionally. There has been a decrease in the number of relatives who make their home with the family. At an earlier date relief was granted to the needy aged only when it was shown that their children were financially unable to support them; but now the trend is not to hold the children responsible for the economic support of their parents. There also appears to be an increasingly unfavorable attitude toward having elderly parents live with their children.

Byrd¹ quoted Spaulding who stated that the fundamental process underlying current changes in our family system is the shift from the agricultural way of life to one based on industry and commerce in the city. The rise of industry tends to take people out of their homes for economic production. According to Duvall² only 17 per cent of our households were on farms in 1947.

Cavan³ quoted Young who described the family that appeared to be emerging in modern society:

¹Oliver E. Byrd, Family Life Sourcebook, p. 229.

²Duvall, op. cit., p. 339.

³Ruth Shonle Cavan, Marriage and Family in the Modern World, p. 8.

The family may be called the companionship family because of its emphasis upon intimate interpersonal associations as its primary function. Other characteristics of the companionship family are: the giving and receiving of affection; the assumption of equality of husband and wife; democracy in family decision; personality development of its members as a family objective; freedom of self-expression; and the expectation that the greatest happiness is to be found in the family.¹

Harris described today's family:

Today's family is the best educated, most experienced, most adaptable, most married, most mobile, and the most insecure, nervous, and least stable in our history. The old values in family life have changed. Thrift is outmoded. Families rate themselves not by bank accounts, but by charge accounts.²

Mead³ said that there is a new post World War II family that most people haven't caught up with yet:

It is one of the oddest families that has ever been seen in the Western world in historic times . . . probably because it is one wherein father has been allowed back into the nursery after having been kept out of it for several thousand years. And we have found that apparently there is a deep tendency in the human male to respond to small children.⁴

Ogburn and Nimkoff listed recent changes in the family noted by experts in the field:

1. Increasing divorce rate.
2. A wider diffusion of birth control and/or decline in family size.
3. Decline in authority of husband and father.
4. Increase in sexual intercourse apart from marriage.

¹Ibid.

²Jessie W. Harris, "Panorama of Home Economics," Journal of Home Economics, 52:88, February, 1960.

³Mead, loc. cit.

⁴Ibid.

5. Increase in number of wives working for pay.
6. Increasing individualism and freedom of family members.
7. Increasing transfer of protective functions from family to state.
8. Decline of religious behavior in marriage and family.¹

The home economics teacher must be aware of the changes that have taken place in the American family so that she will be aware of the problems which will face her pupils, the young homemakers of tomorrow.

ROLES OF FAMILY MEMBERS

In the modern family there is no longer traditional division of men's work and women's work. World War I, depression of the 1930's, and World War II have ended this tradition. During World War II when husbands were away in the service, wives took over the complete management of the family affairs, including such activities as the payment of taxes, supervision and repair to the house, and the upkeep of the family car.

Concepts of family roles which a man and a woman brought to a marriage in the institutional family of the past were essentially those of their parents. With the companionship of present-day American society, concepts of family roles held by engaged and newly married couples today may be widely different from those of their parents.

¹Ogburn and Nimkoff op. cit., p. 7.

Dunn¹ believed that such observations raise the question of whether this helped to account for some of the role confusion said to exist in families in this transition era. As a result of a survey of 436 senior boys and girls selected from seven parishes of North Louisiana she believed that role expectations are largely conditioned by childhood experiences, early education, and environment.

Duvall described the roles of husband and wife a century ago:

When a woman married she slipped into a role of domesticity as definite as her apron. Her work was in the home with her children and the housekeeping jobs to be done. The man was the wage earner and provider.²

Some wives run a home smoothly without their husband's assistance; others rely on their husbands for help in almost every phase of homemaking. Men now help with care of children, dishwashing, and other homemaking tasks. In many homes (both) husband and wife share both the earning and spending. Few jobs are now classified rigidly as either for men or for women.

Young people who enroll in family living classes may bring with them traditional ideas of the roles of men and women in marriage. These future young homemakers will be better equipped to make sound adjustments in their future

¹Marie Dunn, "Marriage Role Expectations of Adolescents," Marriage and Family Living, 22:99, May, 1960.

²Duvall, op. cit., p. 343.

role as husband or wife if they are exposed to these trends in the changing roles of family members.

Employment of women. Home economists are aware of the increase in the number of women working outside the home. Fishbein and Kennedy¹ reported that the crucial importance of the husband's attitude determined the success or failure of the employed homemaker. Studies of successful marriages indicated that a husband can accept the idea of a successful career for his wife without either resentment or demoralization.

Wood and others² reported that many homemakers were able to combine their responsibilities of homemaking and employment successfully and with satisfaction. Others with young and adolescent children often found it exceedingly difficult. Homemakers expressed their frustrations in trying to carry dual responsibilities using only the time and energy they once expended on homemaking alone.

Bragdon related the following:

Women argue that since men combine a career with marriage they should be able to manage it also. The answer is that men can have careers largely because their wives make a career of marriage. No one knows better than women who earn their living how much a breadwinner needs

¹Fishbein and Kennedy, op. cit., p. 278.

²Mildred Wood, Alberta D. Hill, and Edna P. Amidon, Management Problems of Homemakers Employed Outside the Home, p. xi.

a wife, not only to keep house, pay the bills and tend to the thousand troublesome details of life, but to welcome and comfort him after a hard day. In a modest home if both work, who will be the comforter when they meet at night on a chilly hearth or beside the unwashed breakfast dishes?¹

Fishbein and Kennedy² believed that even the best adjusted working wife, when carrying the double load of job and homemaking, must be most sure of her values. He stated:

She (the wife) must realize that the variety of roles now open to women does not mean that every woman must strive to excel in them all. At one and the same time she cannot be the perfect housekeeper, glamour girl, the most sought-after committee member, the best mother, the most successful careerist. She must know herself and the needs of her family and strive to achieve the balance that is right for her particular family.³

Some women question whether or not their families are financially better off because they work. The probable net income from employment outside the home could be determined, Wood and others⁴ believed, only by figuring carefully the probable expenses of the job, and the additional costs of maintaining the family, including estimates of indirect costs of working. The costs of working to be appraised included "costs" in terms of time, energy, changed relationships, and delayed family goals.

Thinking through the issues, and carefully weighing

¹Elizabeth Bragdon, Women Today, p. 40.

²Fishbein and Kennedy, op. cit., p. 285.

³Ibid.

⁴Wood and others, op. cit., p. 13.

the advantages and disadvantages of working outside the home will help in making a sound decision that will be satisfactory to the homemaker and her family. The decision to work outside the home is likely to bring the most lasting satisfaction when it is made in terms of its contribution to family goals.

Many working women do not work because of the need for higher family income but because they prefer to work. Wood and others¹ found the reasons women stated for working were to cut down debt; provide savings, education, vacations, or luxuries; escape from boredom; desire to help husband finish education; widowed mother; husband an invalid or temporarily unemployed; medical expense; or too much consumer credit.

The rewards for employment of a homemaker mentioned by Wood and others² include opportunities for personal development and self realization, increased interests and cooperation of all family members in the activities of the home, and satisfaction in supplying needed service to community or society in addition to added income for the family.

The young homemaker of tomorrow is likely to be employed outside the home. She may find herself filling the role of wife, mother, and also assistant breadwinner.

¹Ibid., p. 6

²Ibid., p. 13.

Marriage age. Cavan¹ quoted Christensen who stated that in 1890 men and women were married at the approximate ages of twenty-six and twenty-two respectively. In 1946 the corresponding ages were about twenty-three and twenty. Scattered studies revealed, according to Cavan,² that perhaps 15 to 20 per cent of all undergraduate college students are now married and that the practice is rapidly filtering down to the high school level.

Most studies in 1961, according to Barkley and Hartnell,³ reported the highest proportion of high school pupil marriages among senior girls, with New Mexico highest with 8.1 per cent of the total senior girls married and Iowa lowest with 2.1 per cent.

Teen-age marriage may frequently be a poor risk. Young people of sixteen, seventeen, or eighteen are frequently not yet ready to drop their teen-age outlook and activities. They may not yet be willing to take on the adult outlook and adult activities which go with marriage and establishing a home. The teen-age couple may be ready and willing to accept adult privileges, but they may not fully

¹Cavan, op. cit., p. 252.

²Ibid.

³Margaret V. Barkley and Agnes A. Hartnell, "High School Marriages," Journal of Home Economics, 53:431, June, 1961.

accept adult responsibilities.

Because the couple is young, Force¹ stated that their opportunity to make a wise decision about the choice of a husband or wife is necessarily limited. They have not had a chance to meet many different kinds of people and to have the broad social experience that will give them a sound background for making as important a decision as choosing a life partner. Early marriage may limit the education of both the boy and girl involved. Their ideas may change as they mature. In some cases the reasons for marrying young may be more romantic than realistic.

Moss² quoted Burchinal who generalized that from one-third to one-half of all high school girls who marry are premaritally pregnant. This results in child-rearing pressures without the benefit of any period for marital adjustment and the assumption of the motherhood role with a limited range of education, background, and experience, and probably with only limited information concerning child rearing.

Cavan³ quoted Christensen who discussed a recent study of senior high schools in California. Of the 205 schools studied, 90 per cent reported one or more student marriages during a one-year period. Nearly ten times as many high

¹Force, op. cit., p. 147.

²J. Joel Moss, "Young Families: Who Are They?", Journal of Home Economics, 53:830, December, 1961.

³Cavan, op. cit. p. 253.

school girls had married as had boys, and most of those girls married out-of-school youths. Most of the marrying boys, however, had teamed up with girls still in school. The percentage of married students increased with each year in school. Among girls 2.4 per cent of the sophomore class were married; 4.0 per cent of the junior class, and 5.7 per cent of the senior class. Nearly three-fourths of the girls dropped out of school following their marriage as contrasted with few of the married boys. Christenson's conclusion was, according to Cavan,¹ that the early twenty's is a better time for marriage than the late teens because: (1) Teenagers are not usually mature enough; (2) the younger the couple--the shorter the courtship; and (3) circumstances may not be right. The boy may be facing schooling or military service.

Keeler² developed a Marriage Readiness Scale (MRRS). The MRRS was divided into three parts:

- Part I. Physical, Social, and Emotional Maturity
- Part II. Skills and Abilities of Getting Along with People
- Part III. Homemaking Skills and Abilities³

She administered a questionnaire to 3,456 high school girls in vocational homemaking programs in Nebraska. A

¹Ibid.

²Rhea Keeler, "A Marriage Readiness Rating Scale, (MRRS)," Journal of Home Economics, 54:217, March, 1962.

³Ibid.

representative sample of three hundred from twenty high schools was used for analysis. The MRRS, Keeler¹ indicated, could assist teachers and students to estimate the students' relative degree of readiness for marriage in terms of degree of maturity in the three parts of readiness analyzed. Perhaps the most important use of the scale may be to help the student realize the necessity for gaining a degree of maturity in all areas before marriage, and in seeing the desirability for developing certain homemaking skills and abilities before becoming a wife and mother. A recognition of her needs and a plan toward meeting them may help her in deciding to delay marriage, at least until she has been graduated from high school.

MacNab² reported on three masters' studies made at Cornell University. The studies included comparison of time and money management of student families in which half of the wives were employed and half attended school; and the financial management of beginning families. The findings indicated that these young married couples were very good managers though they did receive financial help from their parents. Parents, as reported in this study, also made notable contributions of furniture and equipment. Conclusions drawn from the studies of beginning families were:

¹Ibid.

²Marian MacNab, "Financial Management," Journal of Home Economics, 53:832-834, December, 1961.

(1) parents are found to play an important supporting role in many ways; (2) most young couples are aware of parental backing and rely on it; and (3) young married couples appreciate some assistance from parents but value their independence equally and try to manage their own affairs as much as possible. The young married couples in these studies appeared to be responsible, ambitious, ingenious, clear-headed, optimistic, and altogether engaging. They were rated as "good managers."

Cavan¹ quoted Christensen, who explained why young people often rush into matrimony:

(1) There is an increasing encouragement for early marriage from contemporary culture. Many of today's musical, literary, and dramatic presentations are designed to stimulate romantic and sexual interests. In consequence, marriage is made to appear as something glamorous, the answer to all problems. This unrealistic overvaluation gives rise to early and steady dating, which can lead to emotional and sexual involvement and eventually to premature marriage. Early dating, going steady, and marriage are "the style" today. Many teenagers follow this course not because they particularly want to, but because of social pressure.

(2) Youthful marriages are, in part, a reflection of the insecurities of our time. The rapid tempo of living, the confusion arising from a complex and changing culture, the tensions of modern war--hot or cold--all tend to propel young people in the direction of steady dating and then marriage.

(3) There are a growing number of unsettled and broken homes, which may leave children feeling rejected and "so alone." Also along with the increasing divorce rate has come an increasing irresponsibility and laxness on the part of parents toward the care and guidance of their children.²

¹Cavan, op. cit., pp. 254-255.

²Ibid.

Cavan¹ stated that another reason for the rush into matrimony is that today marriage tends to be a smaller economic risk than it was in earlier generations. There is also the factor of premarital pregnancy, she indicated.

Duvall² believed that girls and boys today are much less rigidly bound by restriction. "In the days of the horse and buggy, a couple could never get so far away from home on a date that they could not be recognized."

Cavan quoted the importance of a study of the increase in teen-age marriages as seen by Christensen:

In the end it all boils down to the necessity for doing a better job of family life education--in the home by example, and in the school largely by instruction. If we are worrying about high school marriages, why not start by initiating good family life education at the high school level.³

Duvall listed some needs of young homemakers that might be met by education for home and family living. These were:

1. Comfortable moderate-cost housing built around needs of young families.
2. Educational opportunities such as couples' classes, prenatal courses, father forums, mother study groups, and parent educational facilities.
3. Systems of mother's helpers, "sitter" service, housekeeping aid, practical nursing assistance to relieve tired, ill, or busy mothers of some of the daily pressures.

¹ Ibid. p. 255.

² Duvall, loc. cit.

³ Cavan, op. cit., p. 256.

4. Marriage and family-counseling facilities readily accessible to young couples.
5. Practical guidance and assistance in money matters through such devices as co-operative buying clubs, communal use of expensive equipment, suitable outlets for wives interests and eagerness to learn insurance plans and programs, and budgeting aids.
6. Positive health programs for maintaining the family members in good health.
7. Community recreation programs designed to meet the needs of young couples with and without children in wholesome, varied, recreative activities with other like themselves.
8. A true church home for each young couple desirous of it where the new family may root itself in values and a fellowship of lasting worth.¹

All these needs indicate possible implications for the home economics teacher when planning learning experiences for pupils.

The home economics program. The home economics program must be so planned and taught that pupils are prepared for successful personal and family life in the social environment of the times. Objectives for an effective program of home economics in the secondary school must be determined with both immediate and future needs of the pupil in mind.

Peterson² quoted Chittenden who challenged teachers to be sure of three things: (1) that what we are teaching is suitable and useful to the individuals we are teaching;

¹Duvall, op. cit., p. 390.

²Peterson., loc. cit.

(2) that what we are teaching we are teaching at the most effective time in the life span of those we teach, that is, at the time they are most ready and able to learn it; and (3) that how we teach what we teach, when we teach it, is the most economical, vital, and effective way of teaching that we can use.

Wood and others¹ suggested that the growing incidence of early marriages, with young women continuing employment after marriage, has pointed to the importance of premarriage courses that include instruction in home management geared to this new situation. The pattern of women re-entering employment after children are of school age, or grown, has implications for adult education as well.

Barkley and Hartnell² indicated that the home economics profession must assume even a more active and vital role in family life education. She found that one of the main oppositions against family education has been by individuals and groups who believe that this type of education is the function of the home and church.

Institutions of higher education in home economics must evaluate their programs in family life education to assure that their graduates are fully qualified to assume leadership in this area-- teaching, research, working with

¹Wood and others, op. cit., p. 143

²Barkley and Hartnell, op. cit., 433.

families, or whatever their role might be. Every home economics graduate should have enough family life education in the undergraduate program to help her own family and to interpret this subject matter area to others.

Special preparation must be given to majors preparing to teach home economics in junior or senior high schools. Workshops, refresher courses, and in-service meetings on family life education should be held regularly for teachers so that they can keep up-to-date in subject matter and learn new approaches for teaching family life more effectively.

Hurt stated the purposes for courses in family living:

1. Helps adolescent understand herself by learning to establish more satisfying relationships.
2. Helps the adolescent develop various approaches for clarifying and solving her own problems.¹

The role of education expressed by Hurt² is to help the adolescent understand the steps in the problem solving method and to evaluate effectiveness and fallacies in thinking through her problems. Sensitivity to her own values and attitudes would help her understand the alternatives possible in any problem-solving situation and to choose the alternative which will give greatest satisfaction to herself and others. Hurt³ found that one of the teacher's greatest

¹Mary Lee Hurt and Ruth J. Dale, "For Effective Teaching of Home Economics," Journal of Home Economics, 51:350, May, 1959.

²Ibid., p. 351

³Ibid.

needs is the ability to lead effective problem-solving discussions and to help students gain this ability. Through discussions, pupils have an opportunity to test their own ideas and through listening to views of others within the group are likely to become more understanding and to accept new points of view. A teacher needs to encourage students to be careful in making statements which cannot be supported and to teach them to be scientific in their thinking.

Hunter¹ added that it was also necessary to recognize that limitations due to attitudes of other family members, finances, and social pressures affect the possibilities and adjustments of homemakers. Women said repeatedly they were handicapped by not learning skills in their youth. Yet, many of these women did not seem to be trying to teach children a variety of skills by providing the opportunity for them to learn various household tasks; record keeping and analysis of records was a significant example. It was hard to teach children family management because resources were largely in the hands of adults, and if adults do not share such problems with children, there is no other vital source of learning.

Boys and girls, as well as adults, reported Wood and others² are sometimes fearful that a study of financial

¹Starley M. Hunter, "Homemakers Name Their Home Problems," Journal of Home Economics, 53:527, June, 1961.

²Wood and others, op. cit., p. 140.

management and family relationships will reveal personal and family affairs that are "none of the business" of the teacher or other members of a group.

Byrd¹ quoted Foster, who observed in 1953 that the strongest single educational trend that seems to be blocking the solution of family problems is the almost total lack of scientific inquiry into family behavior and the influences affecting family life.

Forster stated, according to Byrd,² that he thought it was high time that home economics built a scientific foundation for understanding marriage and family problems, as has been done in the field of nutritional research in recent years.

Much progress has been made toward the revision of the home economics curriculum. Many studies have been made investigating the homemakers' problems and needs, with implications for high school home economics.

Wheeler³ investigated the quality curriculum that college-bound students should be taught in high school home economics. She found that they should have an understanding of (1) management of an income and organization of work and leisure; (2) all phases of child development, and why normal

¹Byrd, op. cit., p. 228.

²Ibid., p. 229.

³R. Wheeler, "Home Economics for College-Bound Girls," National Education Association Journal, 49:19, March, 1960.

children develop at different rates; (3) family interaction in different cultures; (4) the basic principles of nutrition and how to establish good food habits; (5) various methods of food preservation; (6) food protection through government agencies and regulations; (7) family economics and the purchasing of clothing, home furnishings, and household equipment; and (8) the application of textile research findings to textile products. Her conclusion was that home economics courses should be geared to college bound as well as to the non-college bound student.

Schubert¹ quoted a follow-up study of forty home economics and education graduates of the University of Wisconsin which was made by Jones in 1954 for the purpose of determining the duties and responsibilities of beginning home economics teachers, problems they experienced in teaching, their strengths and weaknesses, and their education needs. According to the findings, the typical home economics teacher taught only home economics, taught five class periods daily, had three different class preparations daily, taught grades nine through twelve, and taught for nine months of the year. They rendered community services in one or more ways by teaching adult classes, making home visits, assisting with

¹Genevieve Schubert, "Problems and Needs of Young Homemakers - Implications for High School Home Economics," unpublished Doctor's dissertation, pp. 97-98.

open house functions for parents, and by giving individual assistance to community people. Jones, according to Schubert,¹ further stated that, in general, the teachers were satisfied with their preparation in home economics subject matter areas. However, suggestions were made that more practical experience be included in their preparation and that student teaching experience be increased in home economics and be eliminated in the minor subjects.

Wood and others² stated that present trends toward early marriage and girls undertaking, at least for a time, both homemaking and a job outside the home would suggest that many high school students can profit from lessons in home management for the employed home maker. Emphasis on home management is certainly appropriate in the curriculum of secondary schools when there are older girls enrolled in homemaking or family living classes who:

1. Have decided to marry soon and work outside the home.
2. Are making decisions as to whether to work after marriage.
3. Are deciding whether to put off marriage until after they have worked for a while.
4. Are considering the possible need for further occupational professional preparation.³

The need for management skills, and the scope of the content of management as a field of study, indicated,

¹Ibid.

²Wood and Others, op. cit. p. 136.

³Ibid.

according to Wood and others,¹ that a special unit, or at least a series of special lessons, will be needed for students to get a concept of the management process, and to help students see its relation to the many areas of home-making; management of food, management of money, and guidance of children when the mother works outside the home.

Extension service in forty-six states and Puerto Rico visited 511 homes in 1960, reported Hunter,² to learn what homemakers thought about their problems in management of time, energy, money, knowledge, skills, and attitudes. Urban, rural, non-farm, and farm homes were visited. Approximately 20 per cent of the women were thirty-one years of age, about 40 per cent were thirty-one to forty, and 40 per cent were forty-one and older. Sixty per cent thought their hardest problem was time, 40 per cent thought it was money. Management of energy was a major problem for relatively few.

Management of time was considered the hardest problem by many women because of change in the family cycle. Sixty-one per cent of the homemakers blocked time for big jobs. The young wives were somewhat less likely to plan time use than were the older ones. Forty per cent of the homemakers said food-related work required more time than other work, but general housework and ironing took only slightly less

¹Ibid, p. 137.

²Hunter, op. cit., p. 425.

time than food. The family washing was the most time-consuming job for 26 per cent of the women. When asked what labor-saving equipment they would like to have if they could have an additional piece, 23 per cent of the women wanted automatic clothes dryers and 20 per cent automatic washing machines. Dishwashers, small appliances, and home freezers were next in order. Fatigue was stressed in relation to such jobs as cleaning, ironing, and washing. Almost 40 per cent of wives said money was the greatest problem. The implications for home economics education from this study seemed to have been recognition of individual differences and the need to recognize mental and physical differences in family and home. What tires or annoys one woman may stimulate another. It was important to realize that space, facilities, and arrangements available have a bearing on the attitudes and emotional states of individuals when adjustments are considered.

Schubert¹ reported Oehlschlaeger's study conducted in 1955 with thirty-one young urban homemakers in Columbus, Ohio. The emphasis was on their food problems with implications for high school homemaking programs and practices related to feeding the family, sources of help for solving their problems, and suggestions for high school home economic classes. Her findings indicated that these homemakers

¹Schubert, op. cit., p. 24.

received ideas on how to manage their homes from their mother, mother-in-law, other relatives, friends, home economics classes, cook books, radio, T.V., and magazines. The food problems encountered within the families existed because of the attitudes of the young homemakers toward specific activities related to foods, role of the husband in the home, employment status of the wife, adequacies recognized by the homemakers, and their likes and dislikes of homemaking activities. The group felt that high school homemaking programs should place more emphasis on planning balanced diets and time and management schedules. The suggestions were based on the actual experiences of these homemakers and what they realized as essential to know in order to keep house.

Schubert¹ quoted the purpose of Houdyshell's study in 1950 which was to discover how women graduates of Marshalltown High School in Iowa rated the importance of women having education in all aspects of family living before completing their formal education. The six areas were food problems, personal appearance, housing, relationship, marriage and family security, and child development. Questionnaires were mailed to 260 women graduates from Marshalltown High School in 1939, 1944, and 1949. The findings indicated that six areas of family living were rated in importance in the

¹Ibid, p. 25.

following order: (1) relationships, (2) marriage and family security, (3) child development, (4) housing, (5) personal appearance, and (6) food problems. These findings emphasized a definite need to include all aspects of marriage and family relationships in high school programs.

Wilson¹ reported on a workshop held in Des Moines, Iowa, for the purpose of revising their home economics curriculum. The individual objectives which the participating teachers planned to teach within each unit were:

1. Recognize that there is much to be learned and set up reasonable attainable limits in all areas of home economics.
2. Gain respect for the individual personality.
3. Enjoy friends. Know how to be friendly.
4. Realize some values of quiet and relaxation.
5. Carry out family leisure activities.
6. Recognize that the way families spend their money depends on their values.²

The Commission of Life Adjustment Education for Youth, according to Peterson,³ suggested the following considerations for implementing an effective program of home economics for secondary youth.

1. The program be planned for boys as well as girls . . .
2. The needs, problems and interests of pupils and their families are the basis for planning, developing, and evaluating programs of home and family living.
3. Students, parents, teachers, and administrators help plan the objectives, procedures, activities and

¹Erma Wilson, "Revising a Homemaking Curriculum," Journal of Home Economics, 53:11, January, 1961.

²Ibid.

³Peterson, op. cit. p. 63.

- methods of teaching and evaluation.
4. Home and family life education is strengthened through the cooperative efforts of teachers from all subject matter areas concerned with this phase of school program . . .
 5. The program in home and family living is considered an important phase of the total school program . . .
 6. Satisfying human relationships are given major emphasis in programs of home and family living . . .
 7. The ultimate goal for each individual is ability to function effectively as a member of the home and community.¹

Though many recent recommendations have been made for the revision of the home economics curriculum to make family living more satisfying for young people and adults, it is fitting that Ellen Richard's definition of what home economics should represent, according to Bane,² also be remembered:

- The freedom of the home from the dominance of things and due subordination to ideals.
- The utilization of the resources of modern science to improve home life.
- The simplicity in material surroundings which will free the spirit for the more important and permanent interests of the home and society.
- A new home life for today unhampered by the traditions of the past.³

Summary. The investigator has briefly reviewed the history of the family mentioning the gradual change that took place up to the 20th century. In the 20th century the family experienced two world wars and a depression which

¹ Ibid.

² Lita Bane, "The Philosophy of the Early Home Economist," Journal of Home Economics, 51:548, September, 1959.

³ Ibid.

brought about a decided change in the role of the man and woman in the family. Woman's appearance in the employment field brought many problems as well as rewards. Teen-age marriages have alarmed many people interested in the welfare and survival of the family.

FINDINGS IN THIS STUDY

--IMPLICATIONS FOR PROGRAM PLANNING IN THE HIGH SCHOOL

Participants in this study were all graduates from Delia High School between the years 1957-1963. The population of the eight young homemakers used in this study was defined in the same manner as the population used by Schubert.¹ These young women were under twenty-six years of age and had been married from one to five years. Seven of the eight young women in the group filled out and responded to the questionnaire on the problems and needs of young homemakers (Appendix A).

The average age of all the young homemakers was [redacted]. The range was from nineteen to twenty-five years. The average age of their husbands was twenty-five years. The range was from twenty to forty-one years. The average length of marriage for these young couples was 2.9 years.

All seven homemakers had children, representing a total of thirteen. Of the seven families, one had five children, two had two children, and four had one child each.

[redacted] in the family of five.

Two of the young homemakers reported owning their home, four lived in an apartment, and one lived with her

¹Schubert, op. cit., p. 147.

parents. This was a temporary arrangement because the husband was in the United States Air Force and was stationed overseas. Table I shows that all six had several modern homemaking facilities and conveniences; electricity, central heating, running water, range, washing machine, steam iron, television, radio, and bathroom. Five of the families had sewing machines, six reported having a clothes dryer. All seven owned automobiles. When the participants were asked what labor saving device they would like to own which they did not own, a vacuum cleaner was listed by three as being the most desired device. Other devices listed as desired were a sewing machine, dishwasher, garbage disposal, French fryer, rug shampooer, floor buffer, ironer, and food mixer.

Information gathered describing the health of the family members indicated that all the homemakers and their husbands were reported to be in good health.

At the time of the study six of the husbands were employed full time and one was employed part-time. The latter was a college student. The occupations of the husbands included three laborers, an accountant, veterinarian, United States Air Force, and a clerk in a drug store. Six of the husbands were high school graduates; two had been graduated from college; one had attended, and one was attending college.

Information gathered concerning the formal education of the wives indicated that, as a group, they had slightly

TABLE I
HOMEMAKING FACILITIES AND CONVENIENCES
REPORTED BY RESPONDENTS

Type	Per cent *
Electricity	100
Central heating	100
Running water	100
Range (stove)	100
Washing machine	100
Television	100
Radio	100
Bathroom	100
Clothes dryer	86
Newspaper	86
Steam iron	71
Telephone	71
Record player	71
Sewing machine	71
Vacuum cleaner	57
Refrigerator and freezer combination	57
Homemaking magazines	57
Refrigerator	43
Electric iron	43

* of seven respondents

less education than the husbands. Three participants had attended college; one had been graduated from a business college.

Five of the homemakers reported having worked before their marriage. Their occupations included nursing, secretary, bookkeeper, housekeeper, and babysitting. At the time of the study one homemaker was doing dress-making in the home for added income and because she enjoyed it. The young homemaker who was living with her parents was working full-time.

Two questions were asked regarding home responsibilities in relation to limiting participation both in commun-
ity activities and recreational and leisure time activities. The general response was similar to both questions. Having a small baby was listed as the greatest responsibility limiting their activities. This seemed quite normal since they were all young mothers. Other responsibilities mentioned were business in home, irregular hours, and husband's studying.

Table II summarizes the replies to two questions related to the enjoyment of homemaking activities. Cooking was listed the greatest number of times as being the activity most enjoyed by the participants. Further analysis showed that care of children and sewing were also enjoyed. Ironing was listed as the activity least enjoyed by the group.

TABLE II
ENJOYMENT OF HOMEMAKING ACTIVITIES

Activity	Per cent *	
	Most Enjoyed	Least Enjoyed
Cooking	71	
Sewing	57	14
Care of child	43	
Washing	27	14
Baking	14	
Hanging Clothes on line	14	
Ironing		71
Dusting		27
House cleaning		27
Ironing white shirts		14

* of seven respondents

In Schubert's¹ study fourteen tasks were listed as being most enjoyed by the homemakers. Ninety-eight per cent of the respondents listed preparing family meals and baking as being the activities most enjoyed. One-third of the participants said they enjoyed washing dishes, sewing, cleaning, and ironing. Schubert² found that it was significant that meal planning was not included among the activities most enjoyed. Twelve tasks were listed as being the least enjoyed; one-half of her participants listed washing dishes, ironing, and cleaning. Other activities reported less frequently were washing clothes, meal preparation, and mending.

The young homemakers were asked if they had found it difficult to adjust to homemaking activities when they were first married. In reply to this question they indicated difficulties had been in relation to planning schedule of activities and time, planning meals, and full-time employment. There also seemed to be a lack of interest in household activities. One homemaker stated that planning her use of time was still a problem. Schubert³ found in her study that difficulties centered around planning and preparing meals and planning the family budget.

One section of the questionnaire contained a list of

¹ Ibid., p. 153.

² Ibid., p. 159.

³ Ibid. p. 154.

activities usually associated with homemaking. Respondents were asked to check the column which best described their reaction to tasks. Table III indicates that some difficulty was experienced in each of the seven listed categories, and the most frequent difficulty was expressed in food preparation, housekeeping, and clothing. Five of the young women indicated more difficulty in meal planning and unexpected company in the area of foods, daily household care, mending and purchasing clothes, planning time and work schedules, recreation with relatives, and buying furniture than with other phases of these categories. Respondents expressed no difficulty in shopping for the food, washing dishes, care of cleaning tools, washing clothes, paying the bills, mowing the lawn, and interior decorating.

Schubert's¹ study, also recorded in Table III, indicated that some difficulty was encountered within each of the seven listed categories, especially with certain phases of foods, housekeeping, clothing, supervision of children, and management. She stated that more of the young women had difficulty with meal planning and baking in the foods area, remodeling and mending clothes, discipline of children, making major decisions, planning family budgets, and planning time and work schedules than with other phases of these categories.

¹Ibid.

TABLE III
PROBLEM AREAS MOST FREQUENTLY IDENTIFIED
AS CAUSING DIFFICULTIES

Problem Area	Per cent *	
	Ross **	Schubert ***
Unexpected company	71	40
Mending	71	57
Daily house care	57	17
Planning time and work schedules	57	53
Buying furniture	57	29
Planning holiday meals	43	36
Remodeling clothing	43	61
Planning clothing purchases	43	21
Planning family budget	43	49
Recreation - relatives	43	19
Caring for fires	43	9
Seasonal housekeeping	14	38

* to nearest whole per cent

** of seven respondents

*** of 104 respondents

The young homemakers in this study were asked to indicate the source or sources from which they acquired their ideas and techniques on how to manage their home and raise a family. Table IV indicates that their mothers had been a chief source of preparation. Other sources were mother-in-law, other relatives, friends, cookbook, high school home economics, newspapers and magazines, radio and television, 4-H club, neighbors, and commercial sources. One homemaker said her husband was a great help in contributing ideas and techniques.

Schubert¹ found that mothers, cookbooks, newspapers, and magazines were their chief source of ideas and techniques used for managing their homes. The respondent's husband was reported as a source of help by those with children. This seemed to bear out the current trend toward "shared homemaking," especially in families with children.

In conclusion the homemakers were asked this question: "Now that you are a homemaker, what could your school have done to prepare you better for solving your homemaking problems?" They were encouraged to express themselves freely. Responses appeared to cluster in three general areas:

1. Changes of emphasis in home economics courses
2. Content to be included
3. Desirability of studying home economics courses in high school.

¹Ibid., p. 158.

TABLE IV
SOURCES OF IDEAS AND TECHNIQUES
FOR HOMEMAKING

Source	Per cent *
Mother	100
Friends	86
Cook books	86
High school home economics	71
Newspapers and magazines	71
Mother-in-law	57
Other relatives	57
Neighbors	43
4-H Club	29
Radio and television	29
Commercial sources	14
Other sources	14

* of seven homemakers

In relation to possible changes in emphasis, respondents suggested more work in the areas of management of resources, particularly money management.

Examples of suggestions were:

"I wish that we had had lessons on budgets. It is trying sometimes to figure out on how to make ends meet and still have enough for pleasure."

"Because time is limited in a high school home economics course, I believe more hints and helps regarding what qualities to look for when shopping and comparing prices is necessary."

"Stress women working, why not if they don't have any children? Two pay checks are always better than one."

Another area in which respondents felt special emphasis was needed was that of foods, including cooking experience and cuts of meat. Respondents wrote:

"I think we could have benefited from more cooking instruction."

"...should be placed on cuts of meat so when you give you most for your money."

Content suggested for home economic courses included the following areas: management, foods, and safety. Additional learning experiences were suggested:

"Students could make up a list of everything they need to set up housekeeping from waste-baskets to pot-holders, etc., and check what they already have and keep the list for later use. They should be instructed on the cost of living. For an example, if they are looking at apartments--are gas, electricity, and water bills included in the rent or do they have to pay? The difference could mean an extra \$10. or \$ 20."

"Students could make up a stain remover chart and keep it handy."

"Students should know the correct procedure in sew-

ing, sewing on buttons, rips, hems, and so forth. They should also know the correct procedure for ironing."

"Students should know nutritional value of all foods, and how to prepare them to keep their value high."

"Students should know how to prepare food for storage, like canning and freezing."

"Girls should, as an exercise in school, plan menus for three meals a day for a week (for two persons). They should be low cost meals."

"Students should know what to have on hand for minor first aid--maybe insurance benefits from hospitalization."

"Students should know about hazards that might occur around the home and what to do-- such as hot grease catching on fire."

In relation to desirability of studying home economics in high school, one respondent summarized the responsibility of the home economics teacher as follows:

"I think the home economics teacher should instill in her students a desire to be good homemakers, wives, and mothers. If they have the desire, they are sure to succeed."

Another expressed her feelings toward her role as a successful marriage partner:

"Girls should know that good health habits and neatness are important for the young homemaker. She should always have her hair combed and a touch of lipstick too. When her husband comes home he should be greeted with a smile."

An eloquent plea concerning the importance of home economics was made by one respondent:

"I do think that every girl should take courses in homemaking. It teaches you a lot on what to do and how to do the task. She would always be thankful afterwards."

It was obvious that the young homemakers recognized a need for training in all areas of homemaking. General suggestions which would apply to the high school curriculum in home economics were in relation to the areas of foods, management, clothing, housekeeping, and buying. The category of foods seemed to be stressed the greatest number of times. This is significant because pupils often express a dislike for planning menus and time schedules in class. Management of time and money was also listed frequently by these young homemakers as categories which should be emphasized in the high school home economics curriculum, especially in planning budgets and the initial cost of setting up a home. This is also significant because high school pupils often tend to be critical in regard to adult spending.

Schubert¹ found that nearly one-half of her group recognized a need for a sound basic background in all areas of homemaking. Problems in foods and nutrition were listed the greatest number of times, and difficulty was also experienced with planning and preparing meals. Her second most frequently mentioned category was home management. Homemakers felt that more emphasis should be given to planning family budgets, time-saving short-cuts, and new techniques. Homemakers also listed training in certain areas of clothing and textiles could have provided help.

¹ Ibid.

Findings indicated to the investigator that respondents felt that some additional work was needed in all areas of the home economics curriculum, particularly in the areas of foods, management, and safety. Because these young homemakers had a number of modern conveniences so early in their married life there may also be a need for additional training in purchasing large equipment for the home. Perhaps the greatest need is to instill in young women the desire to be successful homemakers and to guide them to a realization that taking care of a home, children, and husband can be a joyous and rewarding experience.

As the investigator works to revise course content in her home economics courses at Delia High School, she will plan to increase the opportunities provided for pupils in the areas of foods, clothing, safety, housekeeping, and consumer buying. The findings indicated that courses should be of more practical value to the student. More class time will be devoted to actual meal planning, keeping in mind the nutritional value and the eye appeal of foods. Added time will be given to the repair and remodeling of garments. Some added time will be given to the discussion of safety in the home. An attempt will be made to integrate the study of management into all areas of home economics, particularly in areas of budgeting, consumer buying, and the use of time in relation to household tasks. The investigator also deems

it desirable to impress further upon the future homemakers the importance of a well groomed wife and mother for the success of happy family living.

SUMMARY

The purposes of this study were (1) to discover the number of young marriages among a selected group of Delia High School graduates; (2) to identify the problem areas in relation to homemaking among the young married subjects; and (3) suggest appropriate revision of present offerings in the high school home economics program.

The kinds of literature reviewed included a brief history of the family, roles of family members, employment of women outside the home, early marriages, and the role of home economics in relation to preparing young women for their future role as homemakers.

The investigator gathered data by a questionnaire adapted from Schubert. The participating group were all graduates from Delia High School between the years 1957-1963. The population in this study was defined in the same manner as the population used by Schubert. These young women were under twenty-six years of age and had been married from one to five years.

All the young husbands were working at the time of the study. Both the young homemakers and their husbands were reported to be in good health.

The young women reported they had ample modern homemaking facilities to perform their homemaking tasks. Those mentioned most often were range, washing machine, iron, tele-

vision, clothes dryer, and sewing machine. The homemakers desired some devices they did not have; the one most desired was a vacuum cleaner.

Having a small baby was listed as the home responsibility which limited the young homemaker in participating both in community activities and recreational and leisure time activities.

When asked the home activity they most enjoyed, cooking was listed the greatest number of times. Ironing was listed as the least enjoyed activity.

The most frequent difficulty associated with home-making was expressed in food preparation, housekeeping, and clothing. The young homemakers indicated that their mothers had been a chief source of ideas and techniques on how to manage a home.

The homemakers were asked, "Now that you are a homemaker, what could your school have done to prepare you better for your homemaking problems?" Responses clustered in three areas.

1. Changes of emphasis in homemaking courses.
2. Content to be included.
3. Taking courses in homemaking.

The young homemakers recognized a need for training in all areas of homemaking. More work was suggested in the areas of management, foods, and safety. Problems of the young homemakers when they were first married indicated also that there was need for additional work in management and

foods.

There also seemed to be a need for creating the desire to be a good homemaker, because our high school pupils of today will be the young homemakers of tomorrow. Respondents indicated that their learnings in home economics classes had been helpful and stressed their conviction that all girls should study home economics during their high school years.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bane, Lita. "The Philosophy of The Early Home Economist," Journal of Home Economics, 51:547-548, September, 1959.
- Barkley, Margaret V. and Agnes A. Hartnell. "High School Marriages: What They Mean for Home Economics," Journal of Home Economics, 53:531-534, June, 1961.
- Bragdon, Elizabeth. Women Today. Boston: Bobbs-Merril Company, Inc., 1953, 335 pp.
- Byrd, Oliver E. Family Life Sourcebook. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1957. 337 pp.
- Cavan, Ruth Shonle. Marriage and Family in the Modern World. New York: Thomas Y. Cromwell Company, 1960. 607 pp.
- Cowles, May, and Ruth P. Dietz. "Time Spent in Home-making Activities by a Selected Group of Wisconsin Homemakers," Journal of Home Economics, 48:29-35, January, 1956.
- Dixon, James P. "Our Changing Society: Impact on Families," Journal of Home Economics, 55:495-500, September, 1963.
- Dunn, Marie. "Marriage Role Expectations of Adolescents," Marriage and Family Living, 22:99-104, May, 1960.
- Duvall, Evelyn. Family Development. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1957, 533 pp.
- Duvall, Ruth. Family Living. New York: MacMillian Company, 1950. 396 pp.
- Elmer, M. C. The Sociology of the Family. Boston: Ginn and Company, 1945. 519 pp.
- Fishbein, Morris, and Ruby Jo Reeves Kennedy. Modern Marriage and Family Living. New York: Oxford University Press, 1957. 545 pp.
- Force, Elizabeth S. Your Family: Today and Tomorrow. Chicago: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1955. 387 pp.
- Fulcomer, David M. "What Are Today's Families Like?" Journal of Home Economics, 55:693-696, November, 1963.

- Harris, Jessie W. "Panorama of Home Economics," Journal of Home Economics, 52:87-89, February, 1960.
- Hunter, Starley M. "Homemakers Name Their Home Problems," Journal of Home Economics, 53:525-527, June, 1961.
- Hurd, Helen G. "The Changing Society and Its Challenges," Journal of Home Economics, 55:85-89, February, 1963.
- Hurt, Mary Lee, and Ruth J. Dale. "For Effective Teaching of Home Economics," Journal of Home Economics, 51:349-351, May, 1959.
- Keeler, Rhea. "A Marriage Readiness Rating Scale (MRRS)," Journal of Home Economics, 54:217-218, March, 1962.
- Koos, Earl Lemon. Marriage. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1957. 334 pp.
- MacNab, Marian. "Financial Management," Journal of Home Economics, 53:832-834, December, 1961.
- Maloch, Francille. "Changing Society and Its Challenges," Journal of Home Economics, 55:415-417, June, 1963.
- Maloch, Francille. "Characteristics of Most and Least Liked Tasks," Journal of Home Economics, 55:413-416, June, 1963.
- McGuire, Marie. "Our Cities Need You," Journal of Home Economics, 55:99-103, February, 1963.
- Mead, Margaret. "How Fares the American Family?" National Parent-Teacher, 49:22-25, February, 1955.
- Millar, Pamelia L. "Home Management Patterns of Three Generations," Journal of Home Economics, 53:95-99, February, 1961.
- Moss, J. Joel. "Young Families: Who Are They? How Do They Manage," Journal of Home Economics, 53:829-831, December, 1961.
- Ogburn, W. F., and M. F. Nimkoff. Technology and the Changing Family. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1955. 329 pp.
- Peterson, Bernadine. "Experimental Use of the Problem Solving Method in Teaching a Home Economics Class," Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, The University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin, 1962.

Schubert, Genevieve, and Julia Dalrymple. "Problems and Needs of Young Homemakers--Implications for High School Home Economics," Journal of Home Economics, 51:365-367, May, 1959.

Schubert, Genevieve. "Problems and Needs of Young Homemakers --Implications for High School Home Economics," Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, The University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin, 1959.

Wells, Helen L. "Financial Management Practices of Young Families," Journal of Home Economics, 51:439-444, June, 1959.

Weil, Mildred W. "The Career Homemaker Role," Journal of Home Economics, 54:294-296, April, 1962.

Wheeler, R. "Home Economics for College-Bound Girls," National Education Association Journal, 49:19, March, 1960.

Wilson, Erma W. "Revising a Homemaking Curriculum," Journal of Home Economics, 53:11, January, 1961.

Wood, Mildred, Alberta D. Hill, and Edna P. Amidon. Management Problems of Homemakers Employed Outside the Home. U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, Vocational Division, Bulletin NO. 289. Home Economics Education Series NO. 33. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1961, 153 pp.

APPENDIX A

CALLING YOUNG HOMEMAKERS

NAME _____ SURVEY NUMBER _____

DIRECTIONS: Please use an X for all replies that require only a check mark. In replies where an X is not to be used, directions will be given accordingly.

PART I. ABOUT YOUR FAMILY AND HOME

1. Location of home:

Street address _____ **city** _____

County	State
--------	-------

2. _____ Number of years married

3. _____ Age of wife

4. _____ Age of husband

5. _____ Number of children

Age

Sex

四
三

—
—
—
—

6. The type of dwelling in which you live:

- #### 7. Facilities for lighting, heating and cleaning:

- Electricity
Central heating
Vacuum cleaner

8. Major kitchen facilities:

- | | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Running water | <input type="checkbox"/> | Dishwasher |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Range (stove) | <input type="checkbox"/> | Refrigerator |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Electric hotplate | <input type="checkbox"/> | Freezer |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Refrigerator and freezer combination | | |

9. Facilities for laundry:

- | | | | |
|--------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|---------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Washing machine | <input type="checkbox"/> | Electric iron |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Clothes dryer | <input type="checkbox"/> | Steam iron |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Ironer (mangle) | | |

10. Other home conveniences:

- | | | | |
|--------------------------|---------------|--------------------------|----------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Telephone | <input type="checkbox"/> | Sewing machine |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Television | <input type="checkbox"/> | Homemaking magazines |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Radio | <input type="checkbox"/> | Newspaper |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Record player | <input type="checkbox"/> | Bathroom |

11. What labor saving devices would you like to own which you do not own? Please list them,

12. Do you own an automobile?

- | | |
|--------------------------|-----|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | No |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Yes |

13. Your husband's health:

- | | |
|--------------------------|------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Good |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Fair |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Poor |

14. Is your husband employed at the present time?

- | | |
|--------------------------|----------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | No |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Yes, part time |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Yes, full time |

Name of occupation _____

15. What is the extent of your husband's education?

- | | |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Graduated from grade school |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Graduated from high school |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Attended college |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Graduated from college |

PART II.

ABOUT YOU

16. Your health:

- Good
 Fair
 Poor

17. Your education:

Graduated from _____ High School in 19_____

Attended College
 Graduated from _____ College in 19_____

Degree _____ Major _____

18. Do certain home responsibilities limit your participation in community activities?

- No
 Yes

If yes, please list the responsibilities.

19. Do certain home responsibilities limit your recreational and leisure time activities?

- No
 Yes

If yes, please list the responsibilities.

20. Were you employed before you married?

- No
 Yes

If yes, type of employment _____

21. Are you employed outside the home at the present time?

- No
 Yes, part time
 Yes, full time

If yes, type of employment _____

Number of hours per week _____

Do you work:

- Chiefly because you need money?
 Chiefly because you like to work?
 _____ (other)

22. If you are not now employed outside your home, have you ever been so during your married life?

- No
 Yes, part time
 Yes, full time

If yes, type of employment _____

Number of hours per week _____

Length of time (weeks, months, years) _____

23. Please list the homemaking activities you most enjoy doing:

24. Please list the homemaking activities you least enjoy doing:

25. Did you find it difficult to manage your homemaking activities when you were first married?

- No
 Yes

If yes, please list the difficulties you had:

26. Do you still find it difficult to manage your home?

No
Yes

If yes, please list the difficulties you have:

—
—

27. Following are some activities that most people do in homemaking. Please read them carefully and then place an X in the column which best describes your reaction.

Activities	I have much diffi- culty	I have occas- ional diffi- culty	I have no diffi- culty	I do not have this re- sponsi- bility
<u>FOOD PREPARATION</u>				
1. Planning family meals				
2. Shopping for the food				
3. Storing the food . . .				
4. Preparing the meals				
5. Baking				
6. Serving the food : : :				
7. Washing the dishes : :				
8. Unexpected company . .				
9. Planning holiday meals				
10. Other entertaining . .				

HOUSEKEEPING

1. Care of cleaning tools
 2. Daily house care . . .
 3. Weekly house cleaning
 4. Seasonal house cleaning
 5. Washing clothes . . .
 6. Ironing.

CLOTHING

1. Mending.
 2. Other upkeep (pressing etc.)
 3. Remodeling or make over
 4. Sewing for the family.
 5. Planning clothing purchases.
 6. Shopping for clothes .

Activities	I have much diffi- culty	I have occas- ional diffi- culty	I have no diffi- culty	I do not have this re- sponsi- bility
<u>SUPERVISION OF</u>				
1. Daily activities of children				
2. Illness of children				
3. Discipline of children				
4. First aid to injured				
5. Illness of other family members				

MANAGERIAL

1. Planning time and work schedules.				
2. Planning family budget				
3. Keeping family records				
4. Paying the bills				
5. Making minor decisions				
6. Making major decisions				

REACREATION AND HEALTH

1. Recreation - relatives				
2. Recreation with other families				
3. Recreation with other couples				
4. Recreation with other women				
5. Family recreation				
6. Trips to doctor, etc.				

OTHER

1. Shoveling snow				
2. Caring for the fires				
3. Mowing the lawn				
4. Gardening				
5. Rearranging furniture				
6. Interior decorating				
7. Upholstery, slip covers etc.				
8. Buying furniture				
9. Buying large equipment (stove, refrigerator)				
10. Buying small equipment				
11. Other: _____				

28. Where do or did you get your ideas and techniques on how to manage your home and raise your family?

_____	Mother	_____	Cook books
_____	Mother-in-law	_____	High school home economics
_____	Other relatives	_____	Newspapers and magazines
_____	Friends	_____	Radio and television
_____	4-H Club	_____	Commercial sources
_____	Neighbors	_____	Other sources:

29. Now that you are a homemaker, what could your high school have done to prepare you better for solving your homemaking problems? Please express yourself freely.

APPENDIX B

Kansas State University

Manhattan, Kansas 66504

March 7, 1964

School of Education
Holton Hall

Dear ,

As a home economics teacher I am interested in knowing how my classes are helping young women be better homemakers. Perhaps you have some ideas as to how your high school home economics courses helped to prepare you for your role as a homemaker. Perhaps, too, you have some problems or questions about certain homemaking tasks. Will you help me by identifying problems that you as a young homemaker have in relation to your homemaking responsibilities?

The information I obtain will be helpful to me as I plan homemaking classes. It will become a part of a Master's Report which I am completing at Kansas State University as a part of the program for my Master of Science degree. I will in no way identify you by name at any time.

I will feel honored if you will complete the enclosed questionnaire and return it to me in the self-addressed envelope by March 20th. May I express my appreciation for your help.

Very truly yours,

Dora C. Ross

Dr. Bernadine Peterson
Director
Home Economics Education

EXPRESSED PROBLEMS OF A SELECTED GROUP OF
YOUNG HOMEMAKERS WITH IMPLICATIONS FOR
A HIGH SCHOOL HOME ECONOMICS PROGRAM

by

DORA CHARLOTTIE ROSS

B. A. Washburn University, 1949

AN ABSTRACT OF A MASTER'S REPORT

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE

School of Education

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

1964

ABSTRACT

Cultural changes affect the family as a social and cultural unit. Effects of such changes are reflected in the changing roles of men and women, fathers and mothers, and in families. Problems and needs of young homemakers can serve as an effective guide in planning for learning in home economics courses, where the focus is on improvement of the lives of individuals and families.

It was the purpose in this study (1) to discover the number of young marriages among a selected group of Delia High School graduates; (2) to identify the problem areas in relation to homemaking among the young married subjects; and (3) to suggest appropriate revisions of present offerings in the high school home economics program at Delia High School.

The information and facts used in this study were obtained from library sources, school records, and a questionnaire adapted by the investigator from one developed by Schubert in a study completed at the University of Wisconsin in 1959 to identify problems and needs of young homemakers. The setting chosen for this study was the rural community of Delia, Kansas. The participating group consisted of seven young homemakers who had graduated from Delia High School between the years of 1957 - 1963. These young women were under twenty-six years of age, had been married from one to five years, and had a total of thirteen children.

The young women reported they had ample modern homemaking facilities to perform their homemaking tasks. Those mentioned most often were range, washing machine, iron, television, clothes dryer, and sewing machine. The most desired device was a vacuum cleaner.

Having a small baby was listed most often as the home responsibility that limited the young homemaker in participating both in community activities and recreational and leisure time activities.

Cooking was listed the greatest number of times as the home activity they most enjoyed. Ironing was listed as the least enjoyed activity.

The most frequent difficulty associated with homemaking was expressed in food preparation, housekeeping, and clothing. Respondents indicated that their mothers had been a chief source of ideas and techniques on how to manage a home.

When asked what the school could have done to prepare them better for their homemaking responsibilities, responses clustered in three areas:

1. Changes of emphasis in homemaking courses.
2. Content to be included.
3. Enrollment in homemaking courses.

Respondents recognized a need for training in all areas of homemaking. More work was suggested in the areas of management, foods, and safety. Respondents indicated that their learnings in home economics classes had been

helpful and stresses their conviction that all girls should study home economics during their high school years.

As the investigator works to revise course content in her home economics courses at Delia High School, she will plan to increase the opportunities provided for pupils in the areas of foods, clothing, safety, housekeeping, and consumer buying. An attempt will be made to integrate the study of management into all areas of home economics, particularly in areas of budgeting, consumer buying, and the use of time in relation to household tasks.